

Written Opinion of the Inter-  
national Searching Authority

Appended Sheet

---

Re Point V

1.) Reference is made to the following documents D:

D1: US 2002/030608 A1 (BOUCOURT GERARD) March 14, 2002

2.) Independent Claim 1

D1 (see Abstract, paragraphs 0001-0003 and 0020 of the specification, as well as Figure 1) describes a device for determining at least one calibrating parameter of at least one image sensor,

- the at least one image sensor (3) monitoring a scene that remains the same (cf. paragraphs 0001-0003),
- at least one processing unit (4) detecting a decalibration of the at least one image sensor (3) in the operation of the at least one image sensor as a function of image signals (cf. paragraph 0020: "autocalibration...is carried out", "The following parameters are extracted from the calibration: Geometrical distortion..."),
- the at least one processing unit (4) determining the at least one calibration parameter as a function of the image signals, in response to a detected decalibration, (cf. paragraph 0020: "The

following parameters are extracted from the calibration:  
geometrical distortion...", "Automatic extraction of the points  
of the locating pattern is carried out, together with correction  
of the distortion on the basis of the parameters..."),

- the at least one image sensor (3) deriving the image signals  
at least from at least one invariant sample in the image  
recording area of the at least one image sensor (cf. paragraph  
0020: "...an autocalibration of detection on a plane locating  
pattern is carried out, this locating pattern being known by the  
system.").

We point out that the feature in Claim 1 "in particular the  
passenger compartment of a motor vehicle" is to be regarded as  
purely optional, and it has no restricting effect for the claim  
(see PCT directions for international search and preliminary  
examination, Chapter V, 5.40).

Thus, D1 shows a device having all the features of Claim 1.  
Therefore, the subject matter of Claim 1 is not novel within the  
meaning of Art. 33(2) PCT.

### 3. Independent Claim 7

For analogous reasons as in the case of Claim 1 (see previous  
point 2), D1 also shows all the features of the method according  
to Claim 7. Therefore, the subject matter of Claim 7 is not  
novel within the meaning of Art. 33(2) PCT.

4. Independent Claim 10

Carrying out the method steps of Claim 7 (see previous point 3) that are known from D1, by a computer program is also already known from D1 (cf. Abstract: "computer...for image processing").

5. Dependent Claims 2-6, 8-9

The dependent claims do not seem to include any features which, in combination with the features of any claim on which they depend, satisfies the requirements of the PCT with regard to novelty and inventive activity. The reasons for this are the following:

Claim 2: This subject matter is anticipated by D1 (cf. paragraph 0020: "plane locating pattern" as reference object installed in the "scene").

Claim 4: This subject matter is anticipated by D1 (cf. paragraph 0020: "Automatic extraction of the points of the locating pattern...", that is, the reference object has a geometrical shape, namely, points).

Claims 5 and 9: This subject matter is anticipated by D1 (cf. paragraph 0020: "...allows the pinpointing...of an object of the scene..., provided that the object is furnished with a locating pattern", that is, the reference object (locating pattern) is installed on a relevant object of the scene with respect to the monitoring function).

Claims 3, 6 and 8: With regard to the features of these claims, what seems to be involved in each case is one of several obvious possibilities for the design or selection of the suitable reference object or invariant pattern, from which one skilled in the art would select, without inventive addition, and corresponding to the circumstances, so as to attain the set object.